UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
	X	
	•	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	:	
	:	
-V-	:	23-CR-367 (JMF)
	:	
OLUSEUN MARTINS OMOLE,	:	<u>ORDER</u>
	:	
Defendant.	:	
	:	
	X	

JESSE M. FURMAN, United States District Judge:

Earlier today, the Court received the attached "THIRD PARTY PETITION FOR AN ORDER TO RETURN PROPERTY AT THE EXPENSE OF THE U.S.A." via mail. The Government shall file a response no later than **April 25, 2025**.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 18, 2025

New York, New York

United States District Judge

.				
1 2 3	Ronald Olajide 4200 Park Blvd Apt. 137 Oakland, CA 94602 510-629-0238 Attorney for Plaintiff: Self-Represented			
4	Honorable Jesse M. Furman			
5	Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse Courtroom: 1105			
6	40 Foley Square New York, NY 10007			
7	TYCW TOTAL IVE TOOUT			
8				
9				
10		1.1.6.1		
11	To the Honorable Judge of the District Court of the United States of America			
12	for the Southern District of New York			
13		1		
14	RONALD OLAJIDE PETITIONER	THIRD PARTY PETITION FOR AN ORDER TO RETURN PROPERTY		
15	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	AT THE EXPENSE OF THE U.S.A.		
16	THIRD PARTY RESPONDENT V. OLUSEUN MARTINS OMOLE, THIRD PARTY RESPONDENT	23 CR. 367 (JMF)		
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
2.7				
28				

1.8

COMES NOW Third-Party Petitioner, Ronald Olajide, and respectfully moves this Honorable Court pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 41(g) for an order directing the United States Government to return property unlawfully retained by the FBI, and to do so at the Government's expense, and in support thereof states as follows:

## **BACKGROUND**

- 1. On January 21, 2025, the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) filed a Response (Dkt. 49) to Petitioner's Third-Party Petition in the above-captioned matter.
- In its Response, the DOJ expressly acknowledged that Petitioner is the superior interest holder in property identified as FBI Items 1B77 through 1B93, hereinafter referred to as "Petitioner's property."
- 3. "When the government has seized property during the course of a criminal investigation, it must return the property once the criminal proceedings have concluded, unless it has a continuing interest in the property." United States v. Chambers, 192 F.3d 374, 377 (3d Cir. 1999)
- 4. The DOJ further stated in its Response that it would effectuate the return of Petitioner's property.
- 5. Despite this acknowledgment, the Government has refused to pay the shipping costs necessary to return Petitioner's property to him in Nigeria, even though Petitioner had already paid for delivery of said items prior to the Government's wrongful retention of them.
- 6. If "A criminal defendant is presumed to have the right to the return of his property once it is no longer needed as evidence" United States v. Martinson, 809 F.2d 1364, 1369 (9th Cir. 1987), it seems quite unreasonable for the government to burden Petitioner who isn't a

1.5 1.6

eriminal defendant with costs to return his property, since he paid for these costs prior to their seizure.

- 7. On April 11, 2025, DOJ representatives informed Petitioner via email that it is Petitioner's "responsibility to take custody of the items and arrange for getting the items to whatever final destination you choose."
- 8. The Government has failed to produce a valid warrant issued in compliance with the Fourth Amendment that particularly describes Petitioner's property as subject to seizure.
- 9. The Government's reference to a warrant allegedly signed on March 7, 2023, by the Honorable Dena Hanovice Palermo, U.S. Magistrate Judge for the Southern District of Texas (Dkt. No. 23-mj-432), fails under Federal Rule of Evidence 1002 to prove that the content of the warrant gives the government authority to seize Petitioner's property, as no original or copy of the warrant describing the property has been presented in this case to justify the Government's continued custody.
- 10. The continued refusal to return Petitioner's property without imposing additional financial burdens on him constitutes an unreasonable seizure under the Fourth Amendment and an unlawful deprivation of property without due process, in violation of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution.
- 11. "Rule 41(g) is a vehicle for returning seized property that is no longer needed for evidentiary purposes, and its equitable remedy allows courts to order return in cases of deprivation or misconduct." United States v. Potes Ramirez, 260 F.3d 1310, 1314 (11th Cir. 2001).

## RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court:

10

11 12

13

14 15

1.6 17

18

19 20

21

2223

24

26

25

27

28

- 1. Order the Government to promptly return FBI Items 1B77 through 1B93 to Petitioner at the Government's expense without stipulations:
- 2. Find that the Government's continued refusal to return the property at its own expense is unreasonable and violative of Petitioner's rights under the Fourth and Fifth Amendments;
- 3. Grant any other relief the Court deems just and proper, including potential costs incurred by Petitioner resulting from the Government's unlawful retention of the property.

Respectfully submitted,

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on April 14, 2025

Petitioner's Signature



Ronald Olajide 4200 Park Blvd Apt. 137 Oakland, CA 94602 510-629-0238 Attorney for Plaintiff: Self-Represented

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11.

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

26

27

28

## **Kevin Gorman** To:

FRIAN

## RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: United States v. Olusen Martin Omole, 23 Cr. 367

Hello Mr. Olajide:

I apologize for the delay in getting back to you. We have discussed this matter internally at great length and have determined that the Government is not able to pay for the costs to ship the items to Nigeria. The extent of the Government's obligation is to make the items available to you for return. The Government has confirmed that the panels are currently in the custody of the FBI office located in New York, however, to the extent it facilitates a resolution, we can arrange for the panels to be sent to any FBI office in the continental United States. At that point, it would be your responsibility to take custody of the items and arrange for getting the items to whatever final destination you choose.

I have attached an update draft of the Stipulation for your review.

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding the above.

Best,

Kevin Gorman
Senior Law Clerk
FSA Government Contractor
Illicit Finance and Money Laundering Unit
US Attorney's Office: SDNY
26 Federal Plaza, 38<sup>th</sup> Floor
New York, New York 10278
(212) 637-2434